Service Delivery Area 3
Regional Advisory Council
Meeting Summary September 8, 2020

View the recording of this meeting here: https://youtu.be/T5v-pJ_Y-tA

1. **Call to Order and Meeting Overview**
   a. SPARK Project Director, Mike Bachman, made welcoming remarks orienting participants to the virtual platform and purpose of the Regional Advisory Council meeting.
   b. Vice Chairperson, Camelia Smith, called the meeting to order and provided an overview of the agenda items and meeting goals, and discussed meeting/Council systems and procedures.

2. **Introductions**
   a. Members introduced themselves by sharing their name, professional role, and stakeholder type (program, community partner, etc.).
   b. Members who were present included: Shannon Garrity, Camelia Smith, Heather Pierce, Lisa Cordle, and Tikila Welch.

3. **Reviewed Old Business**
   a. At the beginning of each Regional Advisory Council (RAC) meeting, the Council reviews action items and recommendations from the previous meeting and discusses progress made.
      i. You can view past meeting minutes and recommendations for each Service Delivery Area (SDA) on the SPARK website: http://indianaspark.com/regional-advisory-councils/.
      ii. Camelia summarized the feedback/recommendations made by the Council at the last meeting related to communication/outreach, business management support, the PTQ rating procedure, and other miscellaneous recommendations.
   b. Prior to this RAC meeting, members from SDAs across the state requested that the RACs discuss the following pressing issues:
      i. Mandatory Trainings: The purpose of this agenda item was to give members space to ask questions and provide feedback and suggestions related to mandatory trainings for licensure.
         1. Members asked how programs are able to access mandatory trainings (I-Lead, in-person, etc.).
            a. Mike shared that trainings are offered three ways: 1) Some trainings are available as live webinars through Indiana Learning Paths, 2) Some trainings, like Safe Sleep, are on demand and can be taken any time, and 3) Some trainings are also being offered in person, but many have been cancelled over the last couple months due to low registration.
         2. RAC members suggested that more of the mandatory trainings be offered as live webinars. This would allow for a facilitator to respond to questions and provide clarification.
         3. Members asked for clarification around what the mandatory trainings list in Indiana Learning Paths includes.
            a. Mike shared that the mandatory training tabs refers to regulation and licensure.
            b. Members suggested that it may be helpful to somehow label trainings in Indiana Learning Paths that are mandatory for PTQ.
            c. Members also shared that some of the training titles are very long, which can make them hard to find.

4. Members shared that offering some trainings (Safe Serve) once a quarter presents a barrier to programs. Members suggested that SPARK and partners look into other places providers can take those trainings and consider how to highlight the options programs have.

ii. Regulatory Barriers: The purpose of this agenda item was to give members space to provide information about regulatory barriers they are facing during this time and any suggestions they have to address these barriers.

1. Members expressed concerns about delays in the fingerprinting process. Many staff are waiting several weeks for an appointment.
2. Members shared that programs are having trouble finding staff and substitutes.
3. Some programs have shared that there are not enough changing/new trainings in Indiana Learning Paths. It is hard for programs to keep up with the annual training requirements without repeating trainings.
4. It cost more this year for programs to train staff in CPR. The training providers required smaller group sizes.

iii. COVID-19: The purpose of this agenda item was to give members space to discuss concerns related to COVID-19.

1. Some programs have had to adjust their schedule and model to meet the needs of school-aged children who are doing virtual learning.
2. Members shared that programs have had to hire additional staff, which has been challenging with fingerprinting delays.
3. It has also been a challenge for programs to engage with families, when they can't do family nights or other in-person events. Some programs have been exploring and using virtual tools to engage with families.
4. Many providers are struggling with enrollment. It may be helpful for SPARK and partners to provide additional resources for marketing and business planning.
5. Programs are having trouble getting On My Way Pre-K and CCDF students through the door. This is an issue with marketing/recruitment, but there also seems to be a delay with getting children through the enrollment and approval process.
   a. Applications are lower this year.
   b. The virtual enrollment process is taking longer, as it involves back and forth communication.

4. **SPARK Project Highlights**
   a. Each quarter, SPARK staff highlights SPARK features that have been implemented recently or will be launched in the upcoming quarter to gain insight, feedback, concerns, suggestions, and recommendations/agreements from the public and RAC members.
   b. Spotlight: PTQ Rating Procedure
      i. Mike provided an update the PTQ Rating Procedure.
      ii. In mid-May, the Office of Early Childhood and Out-of-School Learning sent communication to all programs with guidance about the PTQ rating process. This messaging also included information about inactive voluntary status, when that would expire, and what programs will be expected to do when that status expires.
      iii. SPARK followed up with additional information in June about the five step PTQ rating process. This messaging was included in the SPARK Connect newsletter, sent via email to all I-LEAD users, and sent via text to all those signed up to receive text messages from OECOSL.

iv. This messaging included the reminder that as of July 1st, SPARK would be managing the rating process.

v. In their messaging, SPARK included links and visuals, which aligns with recommendations received from the RACs in the spring.

vi. SPARK's messaging was also added to the Hoosier Childcare banner.

vii. Any program that was set to expire between July 2020 through March 2021 was sent email communication with next steps.

viii. SPARK has uploaded over 30 PTQ Success Tools in the Resources section of Indiana Learning Paths. These tools include:

1. The standards and evidence the rater is looking for (Readiness Checklist)
2. Confirmation Checklist
3. Peer mentoring agreement (Level 4)
4. Supplemental documentation and guidance

ix. SPARK is also engaged in a calling campaign to all programs with an expired PTQ rating. SPARK coaches are providing information about the PTQ rating process and related supports, as well as other SPARK supports.

1. As of August 31st, SPARK has successfully contacted over 250 programs with expired ratings to provide guidance and help them through the process.

x. Since SPARK took this process over on July 1st, 426 ratings have been approved.

1. 19% of programs have received insufficiencies during their rating visits. An insufficiency means that, during the rating visit, the rater found that the program was not fully meeting an expected standard. Programs are given 90 days to correct the insufficiency.
   a. This rate of 19% is similar to the rate in July-August of 2019, which was 16%.
   b. SPARK will continue to track this data point to assess if this process is working.

xi. Questions/feedback from RAC members and the public:

1. RAC members suggested that SPARK and partners send out more communication about how rating visits are being conducted during COVID, so that providers are up to date and feel safe.
2. Members shared that they had heard about programs who reached out to PTQ@indianaspark.com and did not received a response.
3. Members suggested that more messaging related to PTQ enrollment is needed. Programs don't know how to enroll. Many are also interested in fast tracking their enrollment. Adding more about these topics to the SPARK website, as well as partner websites, would be helpful.
4. RAC members would also like to see a video about the PTQ process that they can share and that partners can post to their website.
5. RAC members appreciated that the documents and resources were linked in SPARK's communication. Members shared that the messaging sent by SPARK was clear and concise.

c. Spotlight: Help Desk

i. SPARK's Deputy Director of Operations & Strategic Integration, Kim Hodge, presented on the Help Desk. She provided data and implementation updates. Some of the data highlights included:

1. The Help Desk has served 959 callers since April 1st, with an uptick in calls after July.

2. The most common support categories for these calls were PTQ Support (55%), Indiana Learning Paths (24%), and I-LEAD (9%).
3. The Help Desk connected 26% of callers with key partners to meet their support need.
   a. 229 callers were connected to Early Learning Indiana.
   b. 22 callers were connected to IN AEYC.
   c. 4 callers were connected to their local CCR&R.
4. The Help Desk connected 13% of callers with a SPARK coach.
5. The Help Desk resolved 61% of the callers' support needs during the first call.
6. The Help Desk received most of their calls during weekdays (Monday-Friday) and received two calls on Saturdays.
7. The time of day with the highest number of calls was from 10:00am-2:00pm, with a peak in the early afternoon, which aligns with most programs' nap schedule.
8. SPARK also launched a Help Desk customer satisfaction process. Approximately 7 days after calling, SPARK sends callers a follow-up email to assess their satisfaction. SPARK plans to send this survey sooner in the future.
   a. 91% of callers who answered the follow-up survey said SPARK made it easy to find an answer to their question.
   b. 80% of callers reported that their question or need was resolved.
   c. 85% overall satisfaction rate.
   d. The Help Desk currently has a net promoter score of 52. The industry standard is 50.
   ii. RAC members did not have questions about the Help Desk.
d. Spotlight: Indiana Self-Assessment Tool (I-SAT).
   i. The I-SAT is a program-level self-assessment tool, completed by a program leader. It includes seven standard areas with 50 quality indicators. Programs can choose which sections and quality indicators they want to assess and focus on.
   ii. After completing the I-SAT they connect with a coaching content coordinator, review their results, and discuss the supports available. They can then connect with SPARK's tiered supports as appropriate.
   iii. The I-SAT was launched in April. As of August 31st, SPARK has received 126 I-SAT submissions, which represent 135 programs.
      1. 3% of programs recognized by OECOSL (any program licensed, registered, or CCDF exempt) have submitted the I-SAT.
      2. 44% of participants completed the I-SAT through a live session with SPARK. 56% completed it independently using a self-study tool.
   iv. I-SAT participants also completed a customer satisfaction survey.
      1. 76% felt prepared by taking the Preparing for Program Assessment pre-requisite training.
      2. 71% felt the I-SAT Guide was helpful.
      3. 86% felt SPARK made the experience easy.
      4. 82% overall satisfaction rate.
      5. 37 Net promoter score.
   v. SPARK asked for specific feedback from those who have completed the I-SAT on the I-SAT Guide and if it was helpful.
      1. Some members on the call had completed the I-SAT, but did not remember using the Guide.

5. **RAC Membership Updates**
   a. Margaret Smith, RAC Coordinator, provided an update on RAC membership transitions.
   b. SPARK thanked the current members for their service and contributions over the last year, especially in helping SPARK establish the RAC structure and get the Councils up and running.
   c. Around half of the current members will be completing their term this quarter and cycling off of the Council.
   d. A membership application for new members was released in July and closed in early August.
   e. New members were notified in early September.
   f. All members will participate in virtual orientation sessions over the next two months to kick off the next year.
   g. The RACs will reconvene with their next public meeting in November.

6. **Public Comment**
   a. A member of the public shared concerns about the readability of some tools, like the I-SAT and the Core Knowledge and Competencies document. It was suggested that SPARK and partners assess the readability more thoroughly.

7. **Agreements**
   a. Based on what was presented, RAC discussion, and public comment, the RAC brought forth the following recommendations/agreements for SPARK Learning Lab and/or partners to consider:
      i. Mandatory Trainings
         1. RAC members suggested that the mandatory trainings be offered as live webinars. This would allow for a facilitator to respond to questions and provide clarification.
         2. Members suggested that SPARK and partners shorten training names, so they are easier to find.
         3. Members shared that offering some trainings (Safe Serve) once a quarter presents a barrier to programs. Members suggested that SPARK and partners look into other places providers can take the training and how to highlight the options programs have.
      ii. COVID-19
         1. Many providers are struggling with enrollment. It may be helpful for SPARK and partners to provide additional resources for marketing and business planning.
      iii. PTQ Rating Procedure Update
         1. RAC members suggested that SPARK and partners send out more communication about how rating visits are being conducted during COVID, so that providers are up to date and feel safe.
         2. Members suggested that more messaging related to PTQ enrollment is needed. Programs don't know how to enroll. Many are also interested in fast tracking their enrollment. Adding more about these topics to the SPARK website, as well as partner websites would be helpful.
         3. RAC members would also like to see a video about the PTQ process that they can share and that partners can post to their website.

        iv. I-SAT
           1. A member of the public shared concerns about the readability of some tools, like the I-SAT and the CKC document. It was suggested that SPARK and partners assess the readability more thoroughly.

8. **Future Meeting Schedule**
    a. To be determined, once new members are oriented.

9. **Adjournment**